



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the tolerant attitude that Great Britain adopted toward its colonies, and notably toward those of the self-governing type, are summarized with much skill and cogency.

In a work on so comprehensive a theme one would naturally expect to find something more than an explanation of the process of territorial and political expansion of Great Britain and incidentally of other European states. A proportionate account should have been furnished of the social, economic, moral, and intellectual results of the contact of Europeans with non-European lands and peoples, including the influence exercised by way of reaction upon the European type of civilization itself. Of all this there is hardly a trace. In fact, the reviewer is inclined to doubt whether Professor Muir has ever made a careful study in all its phases of the actual work of expansion carried on by the several European nations, which would enable him to estimate accurately the accomplishments of each as compared with those of Great Britain alone. Had he done so, he would have fallen into fewer errors alike of concept and of statement, such as that the defeat of the Armada "threw the ocean roads of trade open . . . to the sailors of all nations" and "established the Freedom of the Seas" (page 22).

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

La Question d'Orient depuis ses Origines jusqu'à la Grande Guerre.

By ÉDOUARD DRIAULT. Septième Édition. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1917. Pp. xv, 432. 7 fr.)

The Eastern Question: an Historical Study in European Diplomacy.

By J. A. R. MARRIOTT. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1917. Pp. viii, 456. \$5.50.)

M. DRIAULT's book, now appearing in its seventh edition, has for nearly twenty years served as the standard summary in the French language of the history of the question of the Near East. Mr. Marriott presents a new study, intended to provide the English-speaking world with a similar summary. The two works are, however, by no means parallel, because of M. Driault's broader conception: he has taken for his theme the "retreat of Islam" in Europe, Africa, and Asia, meaning the shrinking of the total area ruled by Mohammedan governments; Mr. Marriott limits himself strictly to "the gradual disappearance of the Turkish Empire in Europe" and its causes and consequences. Each gives about three-fourths of his space to the events of the last hundred years. Both writers strive to be impartial, but Mr. Marriott, despite the fact that he produced his entire book during the Great War, succeeds somewhat the better in avoiding particularistic points of view. On the other hand, he confines himself more to the recital of events, without arriving at so many clear generalizations and illuminating interpretations as M. Driault. This is, perhaps, only saying that one writer is French and the other English.

It is not necessary to discuss in detail the nine-tenths of M. Driault's book which is verbally identical with former editions. It contains the same errors of fact and questionable points of view, and the same condensation of style and rapidity of transition which have been noted by previous reviewers (as, for example, Stanley Lane-Poole in the *English Historical Review*, XIV. 805-806). M. Monod's preface stands as written in 1898, with some statements which read prophetically, and only a few which have not been realized; it is still impossible to predict the solution of the Question, which is more than ever left "au dieu des batailles". M. Driault has written a new "Avertissement" (pp. iv), in which he says conservatively of the Eastern Question: "Elle est en vérité aussi vieille que le monde, et elle durera autant que lui, car on se disputerà toujours la possession de ces pays qui sont historiquement les plus prestigieux de la terre". He has failed to learn from recent investigations that the Ottoman Turks did not come in any considerable numbers from Eastern Asia, that they did not close the roads between Europe and Asia and so cause the great discoveries, and that they did not ruin Damascus and Bagdad, which they found already ruined. He expresses his faith that the present struggle will complete the process of the destruction of the Ottoman power, and that the Orient will then enter upon a more brilliant period than any in its previous history.

His historical additions are noteworthy for the restraint with which he holds the narrative of recent events to the proportion of the whole book. He describes the Turkish revolution of 1908 and the Balkan wars (pp. 281-295), the Russo-Japanese War (which is really outside his subject), and the Anglo-Russian *entente* (pp. 325-329), and the Great War as seen from the Orient (pp. 378-398). Finally he brings down to date his views as regards making an end of Turkey (pp. 410-418). In 1898 he thought that the future of Asia and of the Levant rested with the Franco-Russian alliance. He tolerated perforce the English in the Mediterranean, and ignored the Austrians. He was convinced that the extinction of Turkey was certain and near. Now he must reckon with the thrust into the Orient of Germany, whom he portrays as an "eleventh hour" heir, coming in to despoil those of long standing and prescriptive rights. He feels that the Teutons have no place in the Mediterranean, and predicts their complete expulsion, and the division between France, Russia, England, and Italy, of the lands remaining to the Turk. A strictly impartial view, if such be now possible, would see that Germany is no farther away than England from the Mediterranean, and that Austria has no less direct a relation to its waters than Russia. It is interesting to observe M. Driault's opinion that France has held a preponderance everywhere in the conduct of the Great War (p. 394). Willing to leave to England the control of Egypt, he desires the genuine internationalization of the Suez Canal (pp. xii, 374). This is his only glance toward a solution of the Eastern Question by the superior authority of a world government, which as a plan for the establishment

of permanent peace in that region is immeasurably superior to his scheme of wholly independent Balkan states whose boundaries and whose hegemony are endlessly disputable, and a Western Asia partitioned between rival European powers acting on the principle of national self-interest from far-away capitals.

M. Driault's book is totally lacking in maps, notes, genealogical tables, and indexes. A few references to French writings are the only bibliographical indications, since the imperfect lists of the first edition have been omitted. Aside from these, the only apparatus is an unusually full and well-organized table of contents.

Mr. Marriott is apparently more scientific, since he introduces all the above-mentioned features which M. Driault has omitted. (His bibliographical material is given at the foot of the chapters, a proposed general list having been stricken out.) The book is, however, not superior to that of M. Driault in its use of primary material. Nearly all the facts, and even many of the citations and the maps, have been obtained by careful selection from good secondary works. In his introduction he separates the Question as he contemplates it into six threads: the part played by the Ottoman Turks, the position of the Balkan states and adjacent territories, the problem of the Black Sea and the Straits, the position of Russia in Europe, that of the Hapsburg Empire, and the "attitude of the European Powers in general, and of England in particular, towards any and all of the questions enumerated above". All these ideas he follows through consistently, though the first and the last are less fully developed than the others.

He agrees with M. Driault that "the lands which fringe the Eastern Mediterranean . . . have possessed a significance in world-history incomparably greater than any other". He also develops emphatically the obsolete view that the Ottoman Turks "blocked" the roads across the Old World, and forced the circumnavigation of Africa (p. 20). Furthermore, he seems to believe still that the fall of Constantinople caused the Italian Renaissance (p. 64). The narrative is on the whole well planned and carefully proportioned. There is some repetition, however, and in places too many details are introduced.

Errors are not unusually numerous for a work of such complexity. A few may be corrected: it is inexact to say that the Rumanians "have never actually submitted to a conqueror" (p. 44); Bulgarians probably have only a small proportion of Tartar blood (p. 46); the Crimea was taken by subduing the Tartars and not the Genoese (p. 75); one would like to see the proof that Suleiman the Magnificent became master of "much of the coast of Persia and even North Western India" (p. 82); Selim II. was not the eldest of Roxelana's sons (p. 88); the Bug and the Dniester were not "Russian rivers" in 1711 (p. 123); the statement that "Selim III. was as feeble and reactionary as Abdul Hamid had been vigorous and enlightened" (p. 144) should be reversed; Ibrahim, son of Mehemet Ali, and not Mahmoud II., crushed the Wahabis (p. 192,

corrected on p. 206 without noticing the error); the *Tanzimat* gave more than merely military reform (p. 275); Crete was not the last acquisition of the Ottoman Empire in Europe (p. 331). Smaller errors are the use of "Bajazet I." and "Bayazid II.", "Thorgond" for Torgoud, "Oglon" for Oghlou, "Bushan Eddin" for Burhan ed-Din. In general the transliteration of Oriental names is unsystematic.

The few blemishes detract little from the great positive value of the book, which like much of the work of Englishmen succeeds remarkably well in preserving the true historical spirit in a time of warlike passions. Mr. Marriott does not believe that England "put her money on the wrong horse" in 1854, nor that her part in the Treaty of Berlin was wholly a mistaken rôle. He is able to understand if not to sympathize with the Austrian desire to hold Trieste and reach Salonika. He appears to see no fault in the Italian seizure of Tripoli. He realizes, however, not only the Greek and Serbian claims on Macedonia but also those of Bulgaria and perceives (p. 399) how Bulgaria lost the game in 1912 by the necessity of throwing her forces toward Constantinople, while Greece and Serbia were taking possession of Macedonia. As regards the Great War, he sees as its "dominating motive . . . the realization of the dream of a great Central European Empire stretching from the German Ocean to the Bosphorus" and beyond.

Looking to the future, Mr. Marriott considers it essential to enduring peace that the Eastern Question be solved satisfactorily. The Balkan peoples must be freed from German influence, and then must live side by side "on terms, if not of precise mathematical equality, at least of mutual forbearance and goodwill". As to how the second proposal may be effected, he goes a step beyond M. Driault, to federation after the Swiss model, with "constitutional readjustment, neutralization under an international guarantee, and a confederate citizen army". An international guarantee of neutralization is not enough; the cantons of Switzerland had not before federation cut each other's hearts out as have the Balkan peoples; for a long time to come there is need among the latter, after the establishment of just boundaries, of a compulsory peace maintained by a world authority. If the setting up of such a power seems remote, it is nevertheless far more conceivable than a self-sufficient Balkan federation.

A. H. LYBYER.

Science and Learning in France, with a Survey of Opportunities for American Students in French Universities. An Appreciation by American Scholars. (The Society for American Fellowships in French Universities. 1917. Pp. xxxviii, 454. \$1.50.)

THERE is no greater tribute to heroic France than this splendid volume prepared by some ninety-seven devoted admirers, and sponsored by nine hundred and eighty-six sympathetic American scholars and sci-